



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the religious feelings of others? Moreover, to make religious warmth (whether apparent or even real) a test of religious truth seems to me a very dangerous argument. A decorous congregation at a church might show less "warmth" than a Salvation Army Corps. But does that prove that the doctrine of the Salvation Army is truer? Though I sit still and silent in synagogue, I am not prepared to say that I have less religious warmth than a worshipper at an old-fashioned *Cheder*. Or if he has more "warmth," I perhaps have more "truth." If some travellers are to be believed, the most "religious" people are neither Christians nor Jews. By "religious" they mean religious to the eye and ear. But this again is not a necessarily correct test of religious truth. Even if Christianity with its human God did produce greater religious warmth than Judaism in the best sense of the word, that is no convincing proof of its greater truth. Jewish monotheism *may* conceivably need a greater religious capacity for all its height and depth to be realized. Even if (which I must deny) it could be proved that the average man is more likely to feel God near *with* the belief in the Incarnation than without it, I cannot see that this would be any rigid proof of the Incarnation's truth. God brings men and women to him in divers ways and fashions; he makes use of half lights and illusions and errors. Surely we must all admit that, each for our own ends and from a different basis. But to pursue this line of thought, fascinating though it be, would take too long and lead too far.

Meanwhile, a Jewish reviewer cannot be too grateful for Dr. Dalman's essay. He cannot rate too highly his fairmindedness, impartiality, and friendly feeling. I wish he would come to England, and we would show him practically how Jews and Christians respect each other, and how they work together in common service for humanity and for God.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

M. D. CONWAY'S "SOLOMON."

Solomon and Solomonic Literature. By MONCURE DANIEL CONWAY.
(Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co.)

"LIKE to a roe or to a young hart upon the mountains of spices" might have been adopted by Dr. Conway as a motto, describing the method pursued in his book. As he careers gaily from one book of the Old Testament to another, or to Gospels and Epistles, or to Zoroaster and the Zend-Avesta, or to India, and Vishnu, and

Agni, and Indra, the critic who attempts to keep pace with him is likely to feel somewhat exhausted. It may be said, however, at once that the book is not destitute of what is fresh, stimulating, and suggestive. Dr. Conway shows abundant facility in detecting resemblances and analogies; but, in order to genuine discovery, the more tedious task of sifting and proving is indispensable. This task he is too much inclined to disregard.

Our author tells us that he aims at tracing two streams of evolution, one issuing from the wisdom-books, the other from the law-books, "traceable in their collisions, their periods of parallelism, and their convergence,—where, however, their respective inspirations continue distinguishable, like the waters of the Missouri and Mississippi after they flow between the same banks." The first-mentioned stream he regards as Solomonic; the latter he calls Jahvist, but the distinction between the one and the other is made not unfrequently in a somewhat arbitrary manner.

We are told that "the external and historical data are insufficient to prove certainly that an individual Solomon ever existed." "The name Solomon seems to be allegorical." The name given to him by the prophet was Jedidiah ("beloved of Jah"). Dr. Conway finds a parallel to the famous judgment of Solomon in an Oriental tale concerning a damsel of exceptional wisdom and virtue. On two women laying claim to the motherhood of a child, the damsel directed that they should try which was the stronger, each taking hold of one of the boy's hands. When the child through pain should begin to cry, the true mother, full of compassion, would let go, while the false claimant would maintain her hold. The false claimant was the wife, the true, the concubine, of a certain householder, on whose death "possession of the house had to follow motherhood of the child." But if the child had died, the wife would become possessor of the house. Here Dr. Conway finds a motive, a link missing in the Biblical narrative. How, after the householder's death, the concubine was to prove that she was really the mother of the child she had given up in its infancy, he does not inform us, though he thinks she would have a reason for her conduct which the true mother in the Biblical narrative has not. He tells us that there appear "some reasons for believing the Oriental tale to be the earlier." On the next page the "some reasons" have expanded, and we read, "Here, then, we find in ancient Indian literature a tale which may be *fairly regarded as the origin* of the 'Judgment of Solomon.'" But it is right to say that before making this statement he refers also to a variant story in which Buddha himself appears as judge.

In Dr. Conway's opinion there is no evidence that the God of Israel

was known either as Jah or Jahveh in Solomon's time. As to how the name came into use or whence it was derived he offers no suggestion. He alludes to the names of the apes and peacocks of 1 Kings x. 22 as proving the possibility of the importation of Oriental tales from India; and this intercourse with the East is certainly of no small consequence. He makes repeated reference to the Queen of Sheba, regarding her as a "Queen of the Seven," forgetting the slight philological difficulty presented by the difference between שבע and שבעה . This is in the chapter on "The Book of Proverbs," where also we are strangely told that "Nishma," that is נִשְׁמָה , occurs only in Prov. xx. 27 and Job xxvi. 4. Here, also, there are a number of quotations designed to show parallels or discrepancies between alleged Solomonic and Jahvist elements. A single example must suffice. Dr. Conway gives as the translation of Prov. xxvii. 21 :—

"The fining pot for silver and the furnace for gold,
And a man is *proved* by that which he praiseth."

He italicizes the word "proved," and compares xvii. 3 :—

"The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold,
But Jahveh trieth hearts."

Here, he says, "the Jahvist has made a slip by which his hand is confessed." There is reason to fear that it is rather of Dr. Conway himself that this may be said. The Hebrew has no word for the emphatic "*proved*." What is the true sense of the somewhat obscure verse, Prov. xxvii. 21, it is not necessary now to inquire.

With regard to a view of "the Song of Songs" now attracting a good deal of attention, Dr. Conway observes :—

"The theory that the book is a collection of bridal songs, and that the mention of Solomon is due to an Eastern custom of designating the bridegroom and bride as Solomon and Queen Shulamith, during their honeymoon, does not seem consistent with the fact that in several allusions to Solomon his royal state is slighted, whereas only compliments would be paid to a bridegroom."

The book is looked upon by our author as consisting of several songs of different degrees of antiquity, giving collectively "the impression of a romance conveyed in idylls, each presenting a picturesque situation, or a scene, the general theme and *motif* being that of the great Solomonic Psalm," that is, the forty-fifth.

The treatment of Ecclesiastes is scanty and inadequate. This is remarkable in a work dedicated, as is that before us, to the Omar Khayyam Club. It was the late Dean Plumptre who, at considerable

length, traced a parallelism between Ecclesiastes and the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, whom he designated "a Persian Koheleth of the twelfth century."

With regard to the riddle of the name Koheleth, or Qoheleth, as some writers give it, Dr. Conway says, Renan "has shown conclusively, as I think, that the signature on this book, QHLT, is a mere letter-play on the word 'Solomon.'" Now what does Renan say on the page of his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* to which reference is made? "קהלת est certainement un équivalent de שלמה = *Salomo* par un jeu analogue à l'*athbasch* ou l'*albam*. On n'en a pas encore trouvé le secret." Yet this is what Dr. Conway regards as conclusive proof. Our author kicks at the very comprehensive dictum, "All is vanity." This is an addition of the "Jahvist." There are some things which Koheleth "finds not vanity—youth, and wedded love, and work that is congenial." Such a statement as this needs no refutation. But as to "congenial work," it would almost seem that Dr. Conway has not read the second chapter of the book.

Of Ecclesiasticus we learn for the first time that "it is the book of reconciliation between Solomonism and Jahvism,—or, as we should now say, between philosophy and theology." It "is the antidote to Ecclesiastes." What is said on the "Wisdom of Solomon" appears more suitable and pertinent; but it would take too long to attempt a full discussion. The chapters on "The Epistle to the Hebrews as a Sequel to 'Wisdom,'" on "Solomon Melchizedek," and what follows it might be scarcely desirable to discuss, even if space permitted.

There are some incidental notices which are not without interest; as of the "Banquet" which, at South Place Chapel, was substituted for the Eucharist, and which, it seems, was attended by Leigh Hunt, Mill, Thomas Campbell, Jerrold, and some distinguished ladies. In the chapter on "Ecclesiastes" there is an account of a conversation between Tennyson and Maurice, taken from an American magazine. "Speaking of Ecclesiastes, Tennyson said it was the one book the admission of which into the canon he could not understand; it was so utterly pessimistic—of the earth, earthy." Maurice fired up, "Yes, if you leave out the last two verses." "So long as you look only down upon earth all is 'vanity of vanities.' But if you look up there is a God, the judge of good and evil. Tennyson said he would think over the matter from that point of view." Tennyson, we are told, moreover, "was curiously unconscious of his own pessimism." He is reported to have "said to Tyndall that if he knew there was no future life he would regard the creator of human beings as a demon, and shake his fist in his eternal face." Supposing this to be true, it tends to show, if evidence were needed, that distinguished

poets can say very foolish things. Corroborative testimony, to some extent, is furnished by *In Memoriam*, CXX, where, after expressing the opinion, "I think we are not wholly brain," the poet in the next stanza proceeds:—

"Not only cunning casts in clay:
Let Science prove we are, and then
What matters Science unto men,
At least to me? I would not stay."

The last words evidently express a conditional purpose to commit suicide. And suicide, from one point of view, would be regarded, no doubt, as shaking one's fist in the face of the Eternal.

But, with respect to the genuineness of the closing verses of *Ecclesiastes*, Maurice was undoubtedly right. It has been justly said that, without these verses, the book must be regarded as aimless.

THOMAS TYLER.

STREANE'S "ECCLESIASTES."

Ecclesiastes; or the Preacher. Explained by ANNESLEY W. STREANE,
D.D. (Methuen & Co.)

THIS commentary forms part of a series entitled "The Churchman's Bible," and designed, it would appear, to include eventually the whole of the Biblical books. The General Preface informs us that, "while taking into account the latest results of critical research," it "is intended to be of service to the general reader in the practical and devotional study of Holy Scripture." The design thus set forth we need not discuss, nor is it necessary to express an opinion as to whether additional commentaries conducted in accordance therewith are really wanted. This is a matter for the authors, the general editor, and the publishers. We are here concerned with Dr. Streane's Commentary on *Ecclesiastes* as giving "results of critical research." In answer to the question which is likely to be first suggested, What opinion does he express with regard to the date of *Ecclesiastes*? the following quotations may be made:—

"The tone of the book and the character of its teaching not only suggest the period when the Persian Empire had been overthrown, and Alexander the Great's successors had established Greek culture throughout the civilized world, but also bear distinct traces of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy, . . . in particular, of Epicurean philosophy,